

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-20 are pending in the subject application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5-11, and 15-20, and has canceled claims 4 and 14.

The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

In response to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections based on copending U.S. Application No. 10/486,744 set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, Applicant hereby attaches a terminal disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the provisional obvious-type double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 9-12, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yamazaki et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,879,343 B2). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Yamazaki et al.* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 9-11, 19, and 20, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1, 9, and 10 to include the features specified in original claim 4, which the Examiner did not reject on the basis of prior art. Applicant has amended each of independent claims 11, 19, and 20 to include the features specified in original claim 14, which the Examiner did not reject on the basis of prior art. As such, each of independent claims 1, 9-11, 19, and 20 now includes features that are not disclosed in the *Yamazaki et al.* reference. In light of the changes made herein, Applicant has canceled claims 4 and 14.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 9-11, 19, and 20, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Yamazaki et al.* Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, and claim 12, which depends from claim 11, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Yamazaki et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth regarding the applicable independent claim.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamazaki et al.* in view of *Nakami* (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0234153 A1). Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. The deficiencies of the *Yamazaki et al.* reference relative to the subject matter defined in amended claim 1 are discussed above in connection with the anticipation rejection. The *Nakami* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Yamazaki et al.* reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Yamazaki et al.* in view of *Nakami* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-20, as presented herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP041).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Peter B. Martine  
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Customer No. 25920